



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,243	01/30/2004	Jacek Stachurski	TI-35418	8176
23494	7590	03/07/2008	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			SAINT CYR, LEONARD	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75265			2626	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/769,243	STACHURSKI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LEONARD SAINT CYR	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, and 2 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Gersho nor Honda teach or suggest determining bandpass voicing levels for each of a plurality of bands for a frame of speech (Amendment, pages 3, and 4).

The examiner disagrees, Gersho teaches that classification, pitch frequency, and harmonic bandwidth are obtained for every subframe. A class decision for each frame is derived from the subframe decisions. Then the appropriate coding scheme for the class, harmonic, unvoiced, or transition is performed on each frame (col.18, lines 17 - 21). Obtaining classification, pitch frequency, and harmonic bandwidth for every subframe, implies determining bandpass voicing levels for each of a plurality of bands for a frame of speech, since classification of the frame is derived from the subframe decisions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gersho et al., (US Patent 6,233,550), in view of Honda (US Patent 5,495,556).

As per claim 1, Gersho et al., teach a method of speech encoding, comprising: determining bandpass voicing levels for each of a plurality of bands for a frame of speech ("for every frame, a speech classifier module classifies the speech as stationary unvoiced, steady state or transition speech"; col.13, lines 22 – 25; figs 1A, and 1B col.18, lines 17 - 21).

However Gersho et al., do not specifically disclose determining a zero-phase equalization filter for said frame; and that harmonic which fall into a band that was determined to have a voicing level below a threshold are replaced for said zero-phase equalization filter.

Honda teaches that in the phase equalizing-analyzing part coefficients of a phase equalizing filter for rendering the phase characteristic of the speech into a zero phase and reference time points of phase equalization are computed (col.4, lines 5 – 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to render the phase characteristic of the speech into a zero phase as taught by Honda in Gersho et al., because that would help classify the speech signal.

Gersho et al., in view of Honda do not specifically teach that harmonic which fall into a band that was determined to have a voicing level below a threshold are replaced for said zero-phase equalization filter.

However, since Gersho et al., disclose a switchable adaptive codebook may help at a vowel-consonant transition segment or for the case of classification error which classifies a harmonic frame as a transition frame (col.26, lines 22 – 25). One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to replace harmonics when the voicing level is below a threshold, because that would increase the coding robustness to classification errors (col.15, lines 30, and 31).

As per claim 2, Gersho et al., further disclose determining bandpass voicing of step (a) uses the frequency bands 0-500 Hz, 500-1000 Hz, 1000-2000 Hz, 2000-3000 Hz, and 3000-4000 Hz (see figures; figs 1A, and 1B).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard Saint-Cyr whose telephone number is (571) 272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
03/02/08



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER